

Impenetrable Barriers and Canonical Quantization

Piotr Garbaczewski*

Institute of Physics, Pedagogical University

PL-65 069 Zielona Góra, Poland

and

Witold Karwowski

Institute of Theoretical Physics, University of Wrocław,

PL-50 205 Wrocław, Poland

February 7, 2008

Abstract

We address a conceptual issue of reconciling the traditional canonical quantization framework of quantum theory with the spatially restricted quantum dynamics and the related spectral problems for confined and global observables of the quantum system.

1 Motivation

Modern technologies enable one to enslave individual quantum particles in various traps for long time intervals. Manipulations with nanostructures involve a fine tuned control of quantum wells shape and depth that has a decisive influence on blocking or enabling various transport (in fact, tunnelling) phenomena. In all those cases a fairly pragmatic usage of the traditional quantum mechanical formalism shows an acceptable explanatory/predictive power.

A proliferation of papers on various aspects of the infinite potential well, [1] - [7], and on sophisticated "exercises in exact quantization" on half-line, [8] motivates our renewed interest in reconciling the canonical quantization principles with the *sole* analysis of well posed spectral problems for the Hamilton operator, with Dirichlet or Neumann boundary data. The latter, purely spectral (spectroscopy oriented) attitude

*Email: pgar@proton.if.wsp.zgora.pl

is quite strongly represented in the modern literature pertaining to mesoscopic systems, [9, 10, 11]. In the study of so-called quantum billiards (integrable, pseudointegrable and/or chaotic) and of the related microwave cavities, one investigates eigenvalue problems for the Laplacian on a connected and compact domain of arbitrary shape in R^2 , in particular with Dirichlet boundary condition. Normally, that analysis is devoid of any "spurious" canonical quantization input and focuses on statistical properties of eigenvalue series, predominantly with emphasis on the semiclassical regime.

A major surprise in this context is that a careful analysis of the involved *conceptual* background reveals apparent inconsistencies and paradoxes [5, 6, 7], if one seriously attempts to reconcile mathematical models of trapping (space-time localization) with the apparatus of *canonical quantization*, that is commonly believed to underlie the traditional quantum mechanical framework.

The main objective of the present paper is an analysis of the *restricted particle dynamics* in quantum theory and its relation to the canonical quantization (carried out in the standard Schrödinger representation). For clarity of presentation most of our discussion will be confined to quantum mechanics on the real line with a reference Hilbert space $L^2(R^1)$, although much of the argumentation can be directly adopted to higher dimensions.

For a quantum particle that can be anywhere on the real line, there are a priori no restrictions on wave functions ψ , of any external origin, that would keep a particle confined within certain interval on R^1 - for a finite time or indefinitely. We are interested in the situation when the quantum particle is so restricted that it cannot be situated on certain parts of the real line *at any time*, or in the least there is *no* communication (tunneling [12] or any other conceivable form of quantum mechanical transport) between those parts and their complement on R^1 .

Typical examples of such circumstances in quantum theory are provided by introducing impenetrable walls (which can be consistently interpreted as an idealisation of the trapping enclosures on R^1). Such barriers are externally imposed and need to have an effect on the physical characteristics of the quantum system which are conventionally associated with the notion of the (pure or mixed) state of the system and relevant observables. Less spectacular but important examples of impenetrability are related to the existence of nodes or nodal curves (surfaces) of wave functions (cf. the stationary state issue), [12, 13].

Wave functions (solutions of the Schrödinger equation adopted to a chosen situation) carry a probabilistic information about the space-time localization of a parti-

cle. However, this very (localization) notion comes from first assuming that there are the primitive (primordial) kinematic observables related to position and momentum (selfadjoint position and momentum operators with a continuous spectrum) which are inseparable from the concept of *canonical quantization*. It is the *emergent* (secondary) energy observable that sets the unitary (Schrödinger) dynamics for the quantum problem, where $\psi(x, t)$ ultimately appears as a solution of the differential equation with suitable initial/boundary data. Precisely at this point an evident clash occurs between quantum mechanical pragmatism and the deep need for an overall consistency of the formalism employed.

Traditionally one expects that the algebra of observables for a quantum mechanical problem contains suitable self-adjoint operators and the generator of unitary dynamics - the Hamiltonian, needs to be among them. The self-adjointness property is required because of the spectral theorem which sets a unique link between an operator and its family of spectral projections. That in turn allows to state unambiguous "elementary questions" about properties of a physical system (by invoking projection operators to ask for a probability of locating a particle in a given interval, to find its momentum within certain range etc.)

An apparent problem can be seen at once, if we consider a particle on R^1 that is e.g. permanently residing between two impenetrable barriers (rigid walls), set at points $\pm b$, $b \in R^+$. Clearly, that enforces a condition that $\psi(x, t) = 0$ for all $|x| \geq b$. One may think that a Hamiltonian can be simply defined "as it is", like e.g. a differential operator $-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2}$, and then both in-between and outside of the impenetrable walls. The point is that such a globally defined Hamiltonian is not a selfadjoint operator, [15].

A consistent introduction of the *unitary* quantum dynamics needs a careful examination of self-adjoint extensions of otherwise merely symmetric operators and if there are many of them, we encounter a number of *inequivalent* physical evolution problems associated with a unique for all cases symmetric operator.

Another obvious clash with the pedestrian intuition can be immediately invoked if we attach the name of "momentum operator" to the differential expression $(-i\hbar \frac{d}{dx})$ which has a continuous spectrum in reference to quantum particle on R^1 . Other representatives of this operator, but with discrete spectra, would appear if to follow a typical "particle in the box" procedure with periodic boundary conditions.

There is yet another clash involved: "momentum operator eigenfunctions do not exist in a box with rigid (!) walls, since then they would vanish everywhere", [16].

And still another clash occurs, within the fully-fledged pragmatism of the grand textbook discussion, [17], where the "momentum measurement" and the distribution of (continuous !) momentum values in stationary state of a particle in an infinite potential well is considered in minute detail as a re-examination of the subject "from a physical point of view". In fact, in Ref. [17] an explicit answer is formulated for what is "the probability of a measurement of the momentum P (observable) of the particle yielding a result between p and $p + dp$ ". That involves an explicit usage of the Fourier integral for spatially confined wave packets and clearly derives from assuming that the proper meaning of the momentum operator is that it generates spatial translations and the related unitary group of transformations whose arena is the whole of $L^2(R^1)$.

Just an opposite extreme for the infinite well problem was verbalized in the very recent Ref. [7]: "Next we turn to the momentum representation. Since the spectrum of the operator P is discrete, the Hilbert space in the momentum representation reduces to the space l^2 of square summable sequences. This is just a reformulation of the theory of Fourier series as opposed to the Fourier integral that makes a transition between the position and momentum representation for a quantum mechanics on the full line R^1 (nothing of course, forbids one to take the Fourier integral transform of the infinite well wave function $\psi(x, t)$, but the result is just a mathematically equivalent version of the same object, *not* the momentum representation wave function)". The trouble emerges from the fact that the self-adjoint Hamiltonian operator with the rigid wall (vanishing) Dirichlet boundary data does not at all coincide with an operator $\frac{P^2}{2m}$, where P is taken as a selfadjoint momentum operator. The latter observable respects the periodic boundary data and as such gives rise to a quantization *on a circle*, with $\frac{P^2}{2m}$ representing the so-called plane rotator Hamiltonian, and thus bears no trace of reference to the original infinite well problem.

While on R^1 , we must also address an issue of the exterior of impenetrable barriers set for the infinite well problem, or a simpler case of one permanently installed impenetrable barrier dividing R^1 into two non-communicating segments. Then a quantum particle, if at all in existence, is restricted to stay effectively on the half-line, *either* positive or negative. In that case, the positive and negative semiaxis correspond to disjoint, completely independent quantum mechanical problems. The Schrödinger particle on a half-line is a generic case, [18], where we have nicely elucidated major obstacles that hamper the "pragmatic" usage of symmetric operators, without paying attention to their self-adjointness, and in particular to the very existence of the unitarily implemented dynamics.

In turn, that example is diagnostic to the proper handling of quantum phenomenology, when the priority of functional analysis (operator self-adjointness issue) is put forward against physical intuition. Clearly, the problem of self-adjoint extensions of both the free $-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}$ and perturbed (conservative) Hamiltonian on the half-line is a classic. We would like to recall at this point that a symmetric momentum operator $-i\hbar \frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ not only is *not* self-adjoint, but even has *no* self-adjoint extensions when analyzed exclusively in $L^2(R^+)$ or $L^2(R^-)$. That made the authors of Ref. [5] to conclude: "the momentum is not a measurable quantity in that situation!".

Leaving aside a delicate issue of what is actually meant by the "momentum measurement" in the half-line or specific mesoscopic (trapping) contexts, we take the view that the major conceptual obstacle behind the previous statement (and similar "paradoxes") involves an improper handling of kinematic observables.

2 Barriers

A quantum particle that is trapped inside the infinite well $0 \leq x \leq \pi$ must have its wave function equal to zero outside the well. That is usually enforced by assuming that the potential $V(x) = \infty$ on the complement of an open interval $(0, \pi)$ in R^1 hence for $x \geq \pi$ and $x \leq 0$, while $V(x) = 0$ between the impenetrable barriers. In view of an infinite discontinuity of the potential, the wave function $\psi(x)$ must vanish for $x \geq \pi$ and $x \leq 0$ and no restrictions are imposed on its gradient at the interval boundaries. Effectively, as far as the sole trapping is concerned, one rather ignores *any restrictions* that would extend to the rest of the real line (although definitely one should *not* ignore that the "rest" of the space itself is in existence) and considers the sufficient conditions for permanent trapping: $\psi(0) = \psi(\pi) = 0$. Periodized well boundary conditions $\psi(n\pi) = 0, n \geq 1$ would be then conceivable as a simplified model of multiple traps and the whole exterior of a given trap would still matter as an ingredient of the formalism.

Even if the particle is a priori confined in one concrete trap, we do not accept the view that one may literally shrink the whole "quantum world" from R^1 to the interior of that concrete interval and thus to the Hilbert space $L^2([0, \pi])$ only. Although all of the pertinent quantum dynamics is confined to the trap $(0, \pi)$, cf. [1]-[7] and [17].

Our point of view is supported by the following reasoning. Given a normalized function $f \in L^2(R^1, dx)$, one may consistently ask text-book questions like "what is a probability to observe a particle in the interval $M \subset R^1$ " or "what is a probability to

obtain the result of momentum measurement in $K \subset R^1$. The answers are standard (as far as we maintain a straightforward R^1 lore):

$$P_{x \in M} = \int_M |f(x)|^2 dx, \quad P_{p \in K} = (2\pi) \int_K |\tilde{f}(p)|^2 dp \quad (1)$$

where $\tilde{f}$ is the Fourier transform of f .

Let us specify suitable domain restrictions for position and momentum operators: $D(Q) = [f \in L^2(R^1); \int_{R^1} |xf(x)|^2 dx < \infty]$ and $D(P) = [f \in L^2(R^1); \int_{R^1} |p\tilde{f}(p)|^2 dp < \infty]$. Clearly, for $f \in D(QP) \cap D(PQ)$ we can evaluate various expectation values, and in particular deduce the Heisenberg indeterminacy relation (in a pure state represented by f) $\Delta P \Delta Q \geq \frac{1}{2}$ (up to the Plack constant $\hbar$) which is a direct consequence of the canonical quantization ansatz $[Q, P] \subset iI$.

If we consider the Heisenberg inequality as one of conceptual cornerstones of quantum theory, there is no way to attribute a pure point spectrum to the physically interpretable momentum operator nor admit bounded "position operators" as physically relevant objects.

In fact, a localization in the interval, which is trivially accomplished by invoking spectral projections for Q whose continuous spectrum extends through R^1 , happens to be misinterpreted as the need to define the whole of the quantum problem to be confined to that finite trap. Clearly, Q when confined to the interval is a bounded operator, but it is not a regular position operator but rather its localized spectral projection on the interval: $P_{[a,b]} Q P_{[a,b]}$.

All the above position-momentum issues are purely kinematical and thus completely divorced from any assumptions about quantum dynamics and the specific choice of the Hamiltonian.

Example 1: We begin from most traditional infinite well problem. In that case, we assume a localization in the interval $[0, \pi]$. Although the boundary (Dirichlet) data demand $\psi(0) = 0 = \psi(\pi)$, we interpret them as $\psi(x) = 0$ for $x \leq 0$ and $x \geq \pi$. That clearly identifies a specific localization on R^1 , instead of an isolated "quantization on an interval" issue. From that point of view, a kinematic question about a momentum information encoded in wave functions with those properties automatically involves the Fourier formalism of Eq. (1) which perfectly works for spatially localized wave packets. In particular, there does not make much sense to ask for the spectral resolution of the "momentum operator" $-i\hbar \frac{d}{dx}$ restricted to that spatial trap, since any nontrivial function with the above Dirichlet boundary data is a localized $L^2(R^1)$ wave packet

and *not* a plane wave. When confined to the trap, the "free particle" Hamiltonian operator eigenfunctions $\psi_n(x) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sin(n+1)x$ are wave packets and correspond to $E_n = (n+1)^2 \frac{\hbar^2}{2m}$, where $n = 0, 1, \dots$. (Notice that the *periodic* boundary conditions would not at all produce a genuine solution of the momentum operator eigenvalue problem but rather the so-called quasi-momenta and corresponding quasi-momentum eigenfunctions, of the form $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \exp(in\hbar x)$, with $x \in [0, \pi]$ which are $L^2(R^1)$ wave packets again and as such are amenable to fully fledged Fourier analysis (1).)

While passing to the problem of the time-evolution we immediately find that *only* in the case of free motion there is a direct connection via spectral theorem between the momentum and Hamilton operators (like e.g. $P^2/2m$). In other cases there appear potentials and/or boundary conditions (eventually – constraints when dynamics on various manifolds is concerned). Notice that the boundary restrictions, sometimes can be interpreted as related to null-set potentials, [12], and possibly as an interaction with the null-set dynamical systems.

Whatever the Hamiltonian may be, we can safely assume that it is bounded from below and that the value 0 is the lowest point in its spectrum.

Given a Hamiltonian operator H , in view of the previously mentioned permanent trapping problems, let us consider the following question: is there an open set $G \subset R^1$ such that whenever $f \in D(H)$ then also $\chi_G f \in D(H)$, where χ_G is the characteristic (indicator) function of G ?

Assume tentatively that the answer is positive. Then, clearly χ_G commutes with spectral projectors of H and hence with the unitary operator $\exp(iHt)$. That would imply an invariance of the subspace $[f \in L^2(R^1); \text{supp } f \subset G]$ with respect to the time evolution. The above localization issue can be re-told otherwise. Namely, in that case the Hilbert space $L^2(R^1)$ and the operator H split into direct sums $L^2(R^1) = L^2(R \setminus G) \oplus L^2(G)$ and $H = H_1 \oplus H_2$, where H_1 is selfadjoint in $L^2(R^1 \setminus G)$ and H_2 is selfadjoint in $L^2(G)$.

The physical and mathematical mechanisms leading to such reduction of the dynamics can be illustrated by a number of examples.

First, we can supplement the previous Example 1 by defining $H = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$ through its specific domain $D(H) = [f \in AC^2(R^1); f, f', f'' \in L^2(R^1), f(0) = f(\pi)]$. The AC^2 notation refers to the absolute continuity of the first derivative which guarantees the existence of the second derivative (in the sense of distributions, as a measurable

function). The operator $\{H, D(H)\}$ is selfadjoint and the decomposition $L^2(R^1) = L^2(R \setminus G) \oplus L^2(G)$, together with $H = H_1 \oplus H_2$, holds true for $G = [0, \pi]$. Thus the traditional infinite well problem is nothing else than the analysis of H_2 in the space $L^2([0, \pi])$.

Example 2: Let us consider an operator belonging to the family of singular problems with the centrifugal potential (possibly modified by the harmonic attraction), [19, 13]:

$$H = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{1}{[n(n-1)x^2]} \quad (2)$$

with $n \geq 2$ and $D(H) = [f \in AC^2(R^1); f, f', f'' \in L^2(R^1), f(0) = 0]$. The above operator H is known to be self-adjoint. The projection operator P_+ defined by $(P_+f)(x) = \chi_{R^+}(x)f(x)$ clearly commutes with H . The singularity of the potential is sufficiently severe to *enforce* the boundary condition $f(0) = 0$ (the *generalized* ground state function (cf. Ref. [14]) may be chosen for this scattering problem in the form $\phi(x) = x^n$).

Notice that we can here equivalently tell about two *separate* quantum problems, respectively on R^+ and R^- (technically that refers to the degenerate ground state). We deal here with the most conspicuous illustration of the fact that a particle cannot be "simultaneously" present in (shared by) disjoint trapping areas, e. g. cannot "live" on both sides of an impenetrable barrier. Once trapped, a particle is enslaved in one particular enclosure only and then cannot be detected in another.

Example 3: The classic Calogero-type problem is defined by

$$H = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + x^2 + \frac{\gamma}{x^2} \quad (3)$$

with the well known spectral solution. The eigenvalues read $E_n = 4n + 2 + (1 + 4\gamma)^{1/2}$, where $n \geq 0$ and $\gamma > -\frac{1}{4}$, with eigenfunctions of the form:

$$f_n(x) = x^{(2\alpha+1)/2} \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right) L_n^\alpha(x^2) \quad (4)$$

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(1 + 4\gamma)^{1/2}$$

$$L_n^\alpha(x^2) = \sum_{\nu=0}^n \frac{(n+\alpha)!}{(n-\nu)!(\alpha+\nu)!} \frac{(-x^2)^\nu}{\nu!}.$$

As in Example 2, we deal with a clear double degeneracy of the ground state and of the whole eigenspace of the self-adjoint operator H . The singularity at $x = 0$ decouples $(-\infty, 0)$ from $(0, +\infty)$ so that $L^2(-\infty, 0)$ and $L^2(0, +\infty)$ are the invariant subspaces for dynamics generated by H . We encounter again two *separate* quantum problems (degenerate ground state), respectively on R^+ and R^- .

In the above example the impenetrable barriers are located at the points where a potential singularity enforces the zero boundary conditions. In particular, such conditions are satisfied by (generalized) ground states and this feature is mathematically responsible for the appearance of impenetrable barriers. Indeed, to that end we can follow a rough argument. Let $\phi \in L^2_{loc}(R^1)$ i. e. we consider all functions which are square integrable on all compact sets in R^1 . If there is a closed set N of Lebesgue measure zero so that (strictly speaking we admit distributions) $\frac{d\phi}{dx} \in L^2_{loc}(R^1 \setminus N)$, then there is a uniquely determined Hamiltonian H such that ϕ is its (generalized) ground state. If $\phi \cdot (x - x_0)^{-1/2}$ is bounded in a neighbourhood of x_0 , then there is an impenetrable barrier at x_0 . For a precise description of this phenomenon in R^n , see e.g. Ref. [12].

Example 4: In contrast to the previous case where the singularity of the potential alone was capable to make the ground state degenerate, due to the impenetrable barrier at the origin, we can impose the existence of barriers as an external boundary condition. Let us introduce a differential expression $H_0 = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$ and observe that for any real q , the function $\psi(x) = \sin(qx)$ solves an equation $H_0\psi = q^2\psi$. The operator $H_q = H_0 - q^2$ is self-adjoint when operating on $D(H_q) = [f \in AC^2(R^1); f, f', f'' \in L^2(R^1), f(\frac{n\pi}{q}) = 0, n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots]$ and $\sin(qx)$ is its generalized ground state. In that case a particle localized at time 0 in a concrete segment $((n-1)\frac{\pi}{q}, n\frac{\pi}{q})$ will be confined there forever. This model can be considered as that of multitrapping enclosures, with impenetrable barriers at points $n\frac{\pi}{q}$.

There is one distinctive feature shared by the above exemplary models: the Hamiltonian is a well defined self-adjoint operator in each case, respecting various confinement (localization) demands. There is however *no* self-adjoint "momentum"-looking operator that would be compatible with the trapping boundary conditions and the corresponding unitary time evolution rule in a trap.

3 Quantum "life" in $L^2([0, \pi])$

Presently we shall devote more attention to self-adjoint operators which can be associated with differential expressions $-\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$ and $-i\frac{d}{dx}$ in $L^2([0, \pi])$. We shall also spend a while on an issue of their physical interpretation. That derives from the fact that there exists a well developed mathematics for various operators localized "on the interval", while their physical relevance is a matter of a specific context: different boundary data refer to an entirely different physics.

Let us reconsider the Hamiltonian versus momentum operators interplay in $L^2(R^1)$. The standard differential expressions, when acting on the space $C_0^\infty(R^1)$ of the infinitely differentiable functions of compact support, define symmetric operators. Since $C_0^\infty(R^1)$ is invariant under differentiation, the operator $-\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$ can be interpreted as the "square" of $-i\frac{d}{dx}$, in the sense of its two consecutive actions.

In order to obtain self-adjoint operators we have a priori two possibilities:

(i) We extend the symmetric operator $-i\frac{d}{dx}$ to a self-adjoint operator $\hat{p}$ which may be called a momentum operator, and *then* define the Hamilton operator $H = \hat{p}^2$ where the square is taken in the sense of the spectral theorem.

(ii) Extend the symmetric operator $-\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$ to a self-adjoint operator H' which may be called a Hamilton operator, and *then* define the momentum operator $\hat{p}' = (H')^{1/2}$ where the square root is taken in the sense of the spectral theorem.

As is well known these two procedures give the same results: $H = H'$, $\hat{p} = \hat{p}'$ if considered in $L^2(R^1)$.

The situation appears to be different, when we pass to $L^2([0, \pi])$. The differential expressions when acting in $C_0^\infty(0, \pi)$ (now we restrict the support to be included in the open interval $(0, \pi) \subset R^1$) define symmetric operators in $L^2([0, \pi])$. Obviously, $C_0^\infty(0, \pi)$ is invariant under differentiation and both procedures (i) and (ii) can be safely utilized, except for the fact that their outcomes (self-adjoint operators) *no longer* coincide.

In what follows we shall refer to the Krein - von Neumann theory of self-adjoint extensions. Let us begin from the case (i).

The closure of $-i\frac{d}{dx}$ as defined on $C_0^\infty(0, \pi)$ is a closed symmetric operator $\bar{p} = -i\frac{d}{dx}$ with the domain $D(\bar{p}) = \{\psi \in AC[0, \pi]; \psi(0) = 0 = \psi(\pi)\}$.

The deficiency index of $\bar{p}$ is $(1, 1)$ and thus it has a one parameter family of self-

adjoint extensions:

$$p_\alpha = -i \frac{d}{dx} \quad (5)$$

$$D(p_\alpha) = \{\psi \in AC[0, \pi]; \psi(0) = \exp(i\alpha) \cdot \psi(\pi)\}$$

$$0 \leq \alpha < 2\pi.$$

For each chosen α there is in $L^2([0, \pi])$ an orthonormal basis which is composed of eigenvectors of p_α :

$$e_n^\alpha(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \exp i(2n + \frac{\alpha}{\pi})x \quad (6)$$

where n takes integer values, while the eigenvalues of p_α read:

$$p_n^\alpha = 2n + \frac{\alpha}{\pi}. \quad (7)$$

That allows to introduce another definition of $D(p_\alpha)$. Namely, if $f \in L^2([0, \pi])$ is expressed in terms of e_n^α :

$$f(x) = \sum_n f_n^\alpha e_n^\alpha(x) \quad (8)$$

then $f \in D(p^\alpha)$ if and only if

$$\sum_n n^2 |f_n^\alpha|^2 < \infty. \quad (9)$$

Now, H_α defined by

$$H_\alpha = (p^\alpha)^2, \quad (10)$$

in the sense of the spectral theorem, has the same family of eigenvectors as p^α , but its eigenvalues read

$$E_n^\alpha = (p_n^\alpha)^2 = (2n + \frac{\alpha}{\pi})^2 \quad (11)$$

for all integer n . (We recall that in the infinite well case we would have $E_n \sim (n+1)^2$ where n is a natural number.)

As a consequence,

$$D(H_\alpha) = \{f = \sum_n f_n^\alpha e_n^\alpha; \sum_n n^4 |f_n^\alpha|^2 < \infty\} \quad (12)$$

and $D(H_\alpha) \subset D(p^\alpha)$ and $D(p^\alpha) = p^\alpha D(H_\alpha)$. Therefore the operator H_α , Eq. (10) can be safely interpreted as two consecutive actions of p^α , Eq. (5) where both operators are self-adjoint. Also, there follows that

$$H_\alpha = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} \quad (13)$$

$$D(H_\alpha) = \{f \in AC^2[0, \pi]; f(0) = \exp(i\alpha) \cdot f(\pi), f'(0) = \exp(i\alpha) \cdot f'(\pi)\}.$$

Notice that in the special case of $\alpha = 0$ one ends up with a degenerate spectrum $E_n = (2n)^2$, where n takes integer values. That corresponds to the familiar plane rotator problem.

Now we turn to the procedure (ii).

The closure of $-\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$ as defined on $C_0^\infty(0, \pi)$ is $\overline{H} = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$, $D(\overline{H}) = \{\psi \in AC^2[0, \pi]; \psi(0) = \psi(\pi) = \psi'(0) = \psi'(\pi) = 0\}$. This is a closed symmetric operator with the defect index $(2, 2)$. Thus, the family of all self-adjoint extensions of $\overline{H}$ is in one-to-one correspondence with $U(2)$, the family of all 2×2 unitary matrices.

To elucidate this correspondence, let us denote by N_+ the two-dimensional subspace of $L^2([0, \pi])$ with the orthonormal basis:

$$\psi_+^1(x) = (e^{2\pi} - 1)^{-1/2} \exp[(1 - i)x] \quad (14)$$

$$\psi_+^2(x) = (1 - e^{-2\pi})^{-1/2} \exp[-(1 - i)x]$$

and analogously, we set N_- for the linear span of:

$$\psi_-^1(x) = (e^{2\pi} - 1)^{-1/2} \exp[(1 + i)x] \quad (15)$$

$$\psi_-^2(x) = (1 - e^{-2\pi})^{-1/2} \exp[-(1 + i)x].$$

Now define the map $I : N_- \rightarrow N_+$:

$$I\psi_-^{1,2} = \psi_+^{1,2}. \quad (16)$$

Given $U \in U(2)$, then $W = U \cdot I : N_- \rightarrow N_+$ is unitary. The self-adjoint extension of $\overline{H}$ corresponding to U is defined by:

$$D(H_U) = \{g = f + w_- + Ww_-; f \in D(\overline{H}), w_- \in N_-\} \quad (17)$$

$$H_U g = \overline{H} f - 2iw_- + 2iWw_-.$$

In particular, by setting $U = -1$ where 1 stands for the unit 2×2 matrix, we obtain $\psi_-^{1,2}(x) + W\psi_-^{1,2}(x) = \psi_-^{1,2}(x) - \psi_+^{1,2}(x)$ which in view of Eqs. (14), (15) yields $\psi_-^{1,2}(0) + W\psi_-^{1,2}(0) = \psi_-^{1,2}(\pi) + W\psi_-^{1,2}(\pi) = 0$. Clearly, $f \in D(\overline{H})$ implies $f(0) = 0 = f(\pi)$. Accordingly, the choice of $U = -1$ is equivalent to the infinite well boundary conditions and thus we can specify the corresponding infinite well Hamiltonian as follows:

$$D(H_{-1}) = \{g \in AC^2[0, \pi]; g(0) = g(\pi) = 0\} \quad (18)$$

$$(H_{-1}g)(x) = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2}g(x).$$

Now let us define the 2×2 matrix U_α with matrix elements:

$$\begin{aligned} (U_\alpha)_{11} &= (U_\alpha)_{22} = -\frac{1+i}{2} \\ (U_\alpha)_{12}(\chi) &= \frac{i-1}{2}\chi \frac{(1+\chi \exp(\pi))}{(1+\bar{\chi} \exp(\pi))} \\ (U_\alpha)_{21}(\chi) &= (\bar{U}_\alpha)_{12}(\chi) \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where $\chi = \exp(i\alpha)$, $0 \leq \alpha < 2\pi$ and $\bar{\chi}$ and $\bar{U}_\alpha$ stand for complex conjugates of χ and U_α respectively.

By inspection we can verify that this choice of U_α is equivalent to the boundary conditions $g(0) = \exp(i\alpha) \cdot g(\pi)$, $g'(0) = \exp(i\alpha)g'(\pi)$ and thus defines $H_{U_\alpha} = H_\alpha$, Eq. (13) or equivalently Eq. (10), with the domain $D(H_\alpha)$, Eq. (12).

There is clearly *no* apparent physical interpretation for H_α and p_α in the context of the infinite well, or more generally - impenetrable barriers context. Nevertheless, there are physical circumstances under which those operators appear quite naturally, like e.g. the Aharonov-Bohm effect and an involved quantum mechanics on multiply connected configuration spaces, [20]. That refers e.g. to a charged particle in the vicinity of an infinite cylindrical (eventually infinitely thin) solenoid, when the parameter α in H_α can be directly related to the magnetic flux inside the solenoid.

Other instances when operators analogous to H_α are relevant, refer to periodic potential models where e.g. $V(x) \rightarrow \sum_k V(x + k\pi)$ and $V(x)$ is a continuous function with $\text{supp } V \subset (0, \pi)$. With the vanishing (zero) boundary condition at $\pm\infty$ imposed on its domain, the corresponding Hamiltonian is a self-adjoint operator. Mathematically rigorous treatment of the closely related Kronig-Penney model ($V(x)$ is replaced by $\delta(x)$) can be found in Ref. [21].

Let us define in $L^2([0, \pi])$ the following self-adjoint operator:

$$H_{V,\alpha} = -\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + V(x) \tag{20}$$

$$D(H_{V,\alpha}) = \{g_\alpha \in AC^2[0, \pi]; g_\alpha(0) = \exp(i\alpha) \cdot g_\alpha(\pi), g'_\alpha(0) = g'_\alpha(\pi), 0 \leq \alpha < 2\pi\}.$$

As can be readily shown the Hilbert space $L^2(R^1)$ can be unitarily mapped onto a direct integral of copies of $L^2([0, \pi])$ with integration extending over the segment $[0, 2\pi]$. The corresponding direct integral of operators $H_{V,\alpha}$:

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{[0, 2\pi)}^\oplus [H_{V,\alpha}] d\alpha \tag{21}$$

is then equivalent to H_V . In particular, when $V \equiv 0$ then $H_{V,\alpha} = H_\alpha$ and the direct integral (21) is equivalent to $-\frac{d^2}{dx^2}$ in $L^2(R^1)$.

4 Conclusions

The foundations of quantum mechanics employ both the precision of modern mathematical language and an elusive albeit deep intuition based on an analysis of physical phenomena. The major developments in quantum theory and its ability of a successful description of the microworld owe more to the physical intuition than to a precision of the mathematical apparatus. That may presumably stand for a convincing justification of the widespread attitude towards the usage (or rather neglect) of sophisticated mathematical arguments. Although we can regard a correspondence between observables and self-adjoint operators in the Hilbert space as generally accepted, the care for a precise formulation of the operator domains is often considered as an unnecessary nuisance or mathematical pedantry.

On the other hand, mathematically oriented physicists argue that the domain subtleties in the operator analysis do carry a crucial physical information and must not be disregarded. There seems to be no efficient interplay in the literature between those two (diverging) options: intuitive and rigorous. That is exactly the reason of so many "clashes" and "paradoxes" identifiable even in most trivial quantum mechanical problems.

In the context of impenetrable barriers, the canonical quantization issue needs to be under scrutiny. That pertains mostly to operators in $L^2(a, b)$ where the segment (a, b) is bounded from at least one side. In the canonical quantization scheme, the correspondence principle $x \rightarrow \hat{x}$, $p \rightarrow \hat{p} = -i\hbar \frac{d}{dx}$ had been originally introduced in $L^2(R^1)$. Under those circumstances, the intuitive definition of $\hat{x}, \hat{p}$ on smooth functions with reasonable fall-off at infinity is sufficient to determine them uniquely as self-adjoint operators which obey the canonical commutation relations in the Weyl form.

That statement is purely kinematical and thus independent of any dynamics. The fact that $\hat{p}$ commutes with the free Hamiltonian $-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{d^2}{dx^2}$ and thus is a constant of motion for a free particle, clearly supports the view that $\hat{p}$ is the momentum operator.

The Hilbert space $L^2(a, b)$ has *no* a priori physical interpretation. Its physical meaning is closely related to that information on the dynamics which is encoded in the boundary conditions at a and b .

Summarizing our observations let us invoke most frequently discussed cases (with

their own plethora of "paradoxes").

(i) The boundary conditions $f(a) = 0 = f(b)$ correspond to the infinite well problem, and/or to the particle restricted to stay in a semibounded segment. In that case, $L^2(a, b)$ is a subspace of $L^2(R^1)$ which is left invariant by the corresponding dynamics. The momentum operator clearly *is* a measurable quantity, but is defined in the encompassing "mother" space $L^2(R^1)$. There is no self-adjoint momentum operator in $L^2(a, b)$ that would correspond to $-i\hbar \frac{d}{dx}$ and was at the same time compatible with the above boundary conditions.

(ii) The boundary conditions of the type (13) or (20) (up to suitable rescalings) correspond to the dynamics on S^1 . The self-adjoint operator defined by $-i\hbar \frac{d}{d\phi}$ and the periodic boundary conditions ($\alpha = 0$) corresponds to the angular momentum operator of the plane rotator. In case of $\alpha \neq 0$ we deal with the rotational observable for a particle rotating freely around an infinitely thin solenoid. The parameter α value is related to a magnetic flux, [20].

(An analogous reasoning can be carried over to higher dimensions, for quantum particles constrained to remain on a certain manifold. Plane billiards are typical examples in this context.)

Perhaps the most important outcome of our discussion is that, even in the simplest conceivable models of restricted (trapped particle) quantum systems, it is illegitimate to view a particle in the trap as an isolated *small* "mesoscopic quantum world" and ignore the existence of its *large* complement (exterior). (We ignore anyway all of the Universe, importance or lack of importance attributed to the external observer, classical-quantum interplay, decoherence and an infinity of related conceptual issues.)

Specifically, we make a sharp distinction between the primordial kinematic observables, whose eigenvalues are identical with classical phase-space labels, and the emergent energy observable, the Hamiltonian which may involve most sophisticated restrictions in the form of specific boundary data or general constraints. Classically or semiclassically, that is exactly the point where the emergent (!) phase-space structure/topology (interval or S^1 in R^1 , rectangle or cylinder in R^2) would intervene.

References

- [1] D. L. Aronstein, C. R. Stroud, Jr., Phys. Rev. **A 55**, 4526, (1997)
- [2] B. Hu et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 4224, (1999)

- [3] R. W. Robinett, Am. J. Phys. **68**, 410, (2000)
- [4] D. Wójcik et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 5022, (2000)
- [5] G. Bonneau, J. Faraut, G. Valent, Am. J. Phys. **69**, 322, (2001)
- [6] F. Gori et al., Eur. J. Phys. **22**, 53, (2001)
- [7] J-P. Antoine et al, "Temporally Stable Coherent States for Infinite Well and Pöschl-Teller Potentials", (Los Alamos arXiv: math-ph/0012044, 2001)
- [8] A. Voros, J. Phys. A: Math.Gen. **33**, 7423, (2000)
- [9] H-J. Stöckmann, "Quantum Chaos", (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999)
- [10] N. E. Hurt, "Quantum Chaos and Mesoscopic Systems", (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1997)
- [11] F. Chavel, "Eigenvalues in Riemannian Geometry", (Academic Press, Orlando, 1984)
- [12] S. Albeverio et al, Commun. Math. Phys. **81**, 501, (1981)
- [13] Ph. Blanchard, P. Garbaczewski, R. Olkiewicz, J. Math. Phys. **38**, 1, (1997)
- [14] Yu. M. Berezanskii, "Expansion in Eigenfunctions of Self-Adjoint Operators", (AMS, Providence, 1968)
- [15] M. Schechter, "Operator Methods in Quantum Mechanics", (North-Holland, NY, 1981)
- [16] L. I. Schiff, "Quantum Mechanics", (McGraw-Hill, NY, 1968)
- [17] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, B. Diu, F. Laloë, "Quantum Mechanics", vol. I, (Wiley, NY, 1977)
- [18] M. Reed, B. Simon, "Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics", vol. II, (Academic Press, NY, 1975)
- [19] F. Calogero, J. Math. Phys. **10**, 2191, (1969)
- [20] E. A. Carlen, M. I. Loffredo, Phys. Lett. **A 141**, 9, (1989)

- [21] S. Albeverio, F. Gesztesy, R. Høegh-Krohn, H. Holden, "Solvable Models in Quantum Mechanics", (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988)